

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/616,843	3 07/14/2000		Peter Nash	C150.12.3B	6411	
	7590	04/28/2004		EXAM	INER	
RICHARD (HUYNH, P	HUYNH, PHUONG N		
6750 FRANC SUITE 350	EAVEN	NUE SOUTH	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	EDINA, MN 55435				1644	
				DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Ashisani Action	09/616,843	NASH ET AL.					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Phuong Huynh	1644					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 23 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in							
(b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 July 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: 3.⊠ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment							
canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the							
application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly							
raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: None							
Claim(s) objected to: None.							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>14-16,19-24 and 27-32</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> .							
The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10. Other:							
		<u> </u>					

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/616,843

Continuation of 3.

Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The enablement, written description and new matter rejections of claims 14-16, 19-24 and 27-32 are hereby withdrawn in view of the after Final admendment filed 9/23/03.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Claims 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No. 5,080,895 (of record, Jan 1992; PTO 1449) in view of Krause et al (of record, Appl Environ Microbiol 62(3): 815-21; 1996, PTO 892), US Pat No 5,585,098 (Dec 1996, PTO 1449) and US Pat No 5,741,489 (April 1998, PTO 892) for the same reasons of record.

Claims 17-24 and 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No. 5,080,895 (of record, Jan 1992; PTO 1449) in view of Krause et al (of record, Appl Environ Microbiol 62(3): 815-21; 1996, PTO 892), US Pat No 5,585,098 (Dec 1996, PTO 1449) and US Pat No 5,741,489 (April 1998, PTO 892) as applied to claims 14-16 above and further in view of US Pat 6,086,878 (of record, Jul 2000, PTO 892) and US Pat No. 4,166,867 (of record, Sept 1979, PTO 892) for the same reasons of record.

CHRISTINA CHAN

CHNOLOGY CENTER 1600